



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Rev. 05/14/01

Applicants: Thomas C. Terwilliger

Docket No.: S-91,732

Serial No.: 09/512,962

Examiner: Hartter

Filed : February 25, 2000

Art Unit: 1631

For : LIKELIHOOD-BASED MODIFICATION OF EXPERIMENTAL CRYSTAL  
STRUCTURE ELECTRON DENSITY MAPS

RECEIVED

JUN 26 2001

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

BOX NON-FEE AMENDMENT  
Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, DC 20231

ELECTION UNDER RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Sir:

In an action dated May 23, 2001, the Patent Office has required restriction to one of the following inventions:

- I. Claims 1-5, drawn to modeling methods, classified in class 395, subclass 500.23.
- II. Claims 6-9, drawn to selection methods, classified in class 395, subclass 500.05.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:

MAILING

☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the :  
Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

FACSIMILE

☐ transmitted by facsimile to the  
United States Patent and Trademark  
Office

Signature

Ray G. Wilson

(type or print name of person certifying)

Date

June 19, 2001

The Examiner remarks that Groups I and II are distinct in that Group I is concerned with the calculation of the formation of an electron density map of a crystalline structure, while Group II is directed to a method that attempts to match an observed data set to a prior set of known structure factors.

Applicant respectfully traverses the restriction requirement imposed by the Patent Office. The method that is claimed in Claims 1-5 is simply a species of the invention that is claimed in Claims 6-9. In both cases, experimental crystallographic information (Claim 1 steps d.-g.; Claim 6 step a.) is compared (Claim 1 step h.; Claim 6, step a.) with a model or observed set of crystallographic information (Claim 1 steps a.-c.; Claim 6, step a.) using probability (likelihood) functions and adjusting the experimental crystallographic information to maximize the probability (likelihood) of the experimental information (Claim 1 step i.; Claim 6, step b.). The inventions are not distinct and separate inventions and the restriction requirement should be removed.

For purposes of this reply, Applicant elects Claims 6-9, Group II, for prosecution at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 19, 2001

Ray G. Wilson  
Signature of Attorney

Reg. No. 28,351  
Phone (505) 665-3112

Ray G. Wilson  
Los Alamos National Laboratory  
LC/BPL, MS D412  
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545